

Upper critical dimension, dynamic exponent and scaling functions in the mode-coupling theory for the Kardar-Parisi-Zhang equation

Francesca Colaiori and M. A. Moore

Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Manchester, Manchester, M13 9PL, United Kingdom
(February 1, 2008)

We study the mode-coupling approximation for the KPZ equation in the strong coupling regime. By constructing an ansatz consistent with the asymptotic forms of the correlation and response functions we determine the upper critical dimension $d_c = 4$, and the expansion $z = 2 - (d - 4)/4 + O((4 - d)^2)$ around d_c . We find the exact $z = 3/2$ value in $d = 1$, and estimate the values $z \simeq 1.62$, $z \simeq 1.78$, in $d = 2, 3$. The result $d_c = 4$ and the expansion around d_c are very robust and can be derived just from a mild assumption on the relative scale on which the response and correlation functions vary as z approaches 2.

PACS numbers: 05.40.-a, 64.60.Ht, 05.70.Ln, 68.35.Fx

The Kardar-Parisi-Zhang (KPZ) [1] equation is a simple nonlinear Langevin equation, proposed in 1986 as a coarse-grained description of a variety of growth processes. Due to its connection to many other important physical problems (such as the Burgers equation [2], directed polymers in a random medium [3–5], etc.), it has attracted much attention. When applied to a growing interface, described by a single valued height function $h(\mathbf{x}, t)$ on a d -dimensional substrate $\mathbf{x}$ the KPZ equation is:

$$\partial_t h(\mathbf{x}, t) = \nu \nabla^2 h + \frac{\lambda}{2} (\nabla h)^2 + \eta(\mathbf{x}, t), \quad (1)$$

where the first term represents the surface tension forces which tend to smooth the interface, the second describes the non-linear growth locally normal to the surface, and the last is a noise term intended to mimic the stochastic nature of the growth process [6]. We choose the noise to be Gaussian, with zero mean and second moment $\langle \eta(\mathbf{x}, t) \eta(\mathbf{x}', t') \rangle = 2D \delta^d(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}') \delta(t - t')$. The steady state interface profile is usually described in terms of the roughness: $w = \langle h^2(\mathbf{x}, t) \rangle - \langle h(\mathbf{x}, t) \rangle^2$ which for a system of size L behaves like $L^\chi f(t/L^z)$, where $f(x) \rightarrow \text{const}$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$ and $f(x) \sim x^{\chi/z}$ as $x \rightarrow 0$, so that w grows with time like $t^{\chi/z}$ until it saturate to L^χ when $t \sim L^z$. χ and z are the roughness and dynamic exponent respectively.

For $d > 2$ there are two distinct regimes, separated by a critical value of the nonlinearity coefficient. In the weak coupling regime ($\lambda < \lambda_c$) the non-linear term is irrelevant and the behavior is governed by the $\lambda = 0$ fixed point. The linear Edward-Wilkinson equation is recovered, for which the exponents are known exactly $\chi = (2 - d)/2$ and $z = 2$. The more challenging strong coupling regime ($\lambda > \lambda_c$), where the non-linear term is relevant is characterised by anomalous exponents, which are the subject of this paper. From the Galilean invariance [2] (the invariance of equation (1) under an infinitesimal tilting of the surface) one can derive the relation $\chi + z = 2$, which leaves just one independent exponent. For the special

case $d = 1$, the existence of a fluctuation-dissipation theorem leads to the exact result $\chi = 1/2$, $z = 3/2$.

While we have a satisfactory understanding of the KPZ equation in $d = 1$ [7,8] and on the Bethe lattice [4], its behavior in the strong coupling regime when $d > 1$ is controversial. Such results that are known derive mainly from numerical simulations [9] of discrete models which belong to the KPZ universality class [10], and on several promising but far from conclusive analytical approaches [11–18]. Most efforts are oriented towards the determination of z as a function of d for $d > 1$, and to understanding whether there exists an upper critical dimension d_c above which $z = 2$: some analytical arguments suggest the existence of a finite d_c [14–19], while numerical studies [9] and real space methods [20] find no evidence of a finite upper critical dimension. It is our contention that $d_c = 4$, and that the numerical simulations all fail to see evidence for an upper critical dimension because in high dimensions, ($d \geq 4$), they have not been run for sufficiently long time for the roughness w to be in the scaling regime.

We take a self-consistent approach, the mode-coupling (MC) approximation [2], where in the diagrammatic expansion for the correlation and response function only diagrams which do not renormalize the three point vertex λ are retained. The MC approximation has been remarkably successful; it reproduces the exact values of the exponents in $d = 1$ and gives an accurate value for z in $d = 2$. Furthermore the MC equations have been shown to arise from the large N -limit of an generalised N -component KPZ [13], which allows in principle a systematic approach to the theory beyond MC, by expanding in $1/N$.

Because of its relative simplicity and its seeming accuracy, there have been many studies of the mode-coupling approach to KPZ: Hwa, Frey and Tauber [8] studied the $d = 1$ case, where it gives the exact result $z = 3/2$, and solved numerically for the scaling functions. Bouchaud and Cates [12] gave an approximate analytical solution

assuming simple exponential relaxation for each mode. Doherty et al. [13] used instead an ansatz based on the form of the scaling functions in $d = 1$. Both [12,13] found a finite upper critical dimension, with the same value $d_c \simeq 3.6$. Moore et al. [14] found an explicit solution of the MC equations for $d > d_c = 4$ with $z = 2$. (Calculations outside the MC framework which also give $d_c = 4$ include a functional RG calculation [19], renormalization group arguments [17,18], and an expansion around $z = 2$ [16]. None of these give such compelling arguments for $d_c = 4$ to have won general acceptance either for that value for the upper critical dimension or even for the existence of an upper critical dimension). Tu [21] attempted the formidable task of numerically solving the mode coupling equations by direct integration, and found no evidence for an upper critical dimension. We shall comment later on why with his particular numerical technique, problems in locating the upper critical dimension would arise. We believe that one of the reasons why there is a reluctance to accept that there is

an upper critical dimension is that earlier approximate solutions of the MC equations yielded unconvincing non-integer values for the upper critical dimension (such as 3.6...) and that the approach which did give an integer value of four for d_c , [14], did not, however, provide any insights as to the form of the solution in the physically accessible regime, $d < 4$. In this paper we shall give an (approximate) analytical treatment of the MC equations which predicts that d_c is four, gives z correct to $O(4-d)$ and provides some insights into the form of the scaling functions.

The correlation and response function are defined in Fourier space by

$$C(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \langle h(\mathbf{k}, \omega) h^*(\mathbf{k}, \omega) \rangle, \\ G(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \delta^{-d}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}') \delta^{-1}(\omega - \omega') \langle \frac{\partial h(\mathbf{k}, \omega)}{\partial \eta(\mathbf{k}', \omega')} \rangle,$$

where $\langle \cdot \rangle$ indicate an average over η . In the mode coupling approximation, the correlation and response functions are the solutions of two coupled equations,

$$G^{-1}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = G_0^{-1}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) + \lambda^2 \int \frac{d\Omega}{2\pi} \int \frac{d^d q}{(2\pi)^d} [\mathbf{q} \cdot (\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q})] [\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{k}] G(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}, \omega - \Omega) C(\mathbf{q}, \Omega), \quad (2)$$

$$C(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = C_0(\mathbf{k}, \omega) + \frac{\lambda^2}{2} |G(\mathbf{k}, \omega)|^2 \int \frac{d\Omega}{2\pi} \int \frac{d^d q}{(2\pi)^d} [\mathbf{q} \cdot (\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q})]^2 C(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}, \omega - \Omega) C(\mathbf{q}, \Omega), \quad (3)$$

where $G_0(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = (\nu k^2 - i\omega)^{-1}$ is the bare response function, and $C_0(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = 2D |G(\mathbf{k}, \omega)|^2$. In the strong coupling limit, $G(\mathbf{k}, \omega)$ and $C(\mathbf{k}, \omega)$ take the following scaling forms

$$G(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = k^{-z} g(\omega/k^z), \\ C(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = k^{-(2\chi + d + z)} n(\omega/k^z),$$

and Eqs. (2) and (3) translate into the following coupled equations for the scaling functions $n(x)$ and $g(x)$:

$$g^{-1}(x) = -ix + I_1(x), \quad (4)$$

$$n(x) = |g(x)|^2 I_2(x), \quad (5)$$

where $x = \omega/k^z$ and $I_1(x)$ and $I_2(x)$ are given by

$$I_1(x) = P \int_0^\pi d\theta \sin^{d-2} \theta \int_0^\infty dq \cos \theta (\cos \theta - q) q^{2z-3} r^{-z} \int_{-\infty}^\infty dy g\left(\frac{x - q^z y}{r^z}\right) n(y), \\ I_2(x) = \frac{P}{2} \int_0^\pi d\theta \sin^{d-2} \theta \int_0^\infty dq (\cos \theta - q)^2 q^{2z-3} r^{-(d+4-z)} \int_{-\infty}^\infty dy n\left(\frac{x - q^z y}{r^z}\right) n(y),$$

with $P = \lambda^2 / (2^d \Gamma(\frac{d-1}{2}) \pi^{(d+3)/2})$, $r^2 = 1 + q^2 - 2q \cos \theta$.

All the approximate analytical approaches start by making an ansatz on the form of the scaling functions $n(x)$ and $g(x)$. The relation $z = z(d)$ is then obtained requiring consistency of Eqs. (4) and (5) on matching both sides at an arbitrarily chosen value of x . Due to the non-locality of Eqs. (4) and (5), the matching condition depends on the form of the functions n and g for all x , so the ansatz need to be reliable for all x . Previous ansatzes were unsatisfactory, since (as already pointed out by Tu [21]), they did not satisfy the large x asymptotic forms

$$n(x) \sim x^{-1-\beta/z}, \quad g_R(x) \sim x^{-1-2/z}, \quad g_I(x) \rightarrow x^{-1}, \quad (6)$$

where $\beta = d + 4 - 2z$ and $g(x) = g_R(x) + i g_I(x)$.

We will match the left and right hand sides of both Eqs. (4) and Eq. (5) as $x \rightarrow \infty$ using an ansatz that capture this large x asymptotic behavior. It is by doing this that we are able to obtain z correct to $O(4-d)$. It is convenient to first write Eqs. (4) and (5) in Fourier space:

$$\frac{\widehat{g_R}}{|g|^2}(p) = \widehat{I_1}(p), \quad (7)$$

$$\frac{\widehat{n}}{|g|^2}(p) = \widehat{I_2}(p), \quad (8)$$

where $\widehat{I}_1$ is the Fourier transform of the real part of I_1 and $\widehat{I}_2$ is the Fourier transform of I_2

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{I}_1(p) &= 2\pi P \int_0^\pi d\theta \sin^{d-2} \theta \int_0^\infty dq \cos \theta (\cos \theta - q) q^{2z-3} \widehat{g}_R(pr^z) \widehat{n}(pq^z), \\ \widehat{I}_2(p) &= \pi P \int_0^\pi d\theta \sin^{d-2} \theta \int_0^\infty dq (\cos \theta - q)^2 q^{2z-3} r^{-(d+4-2z)} \widehat{n}(pr^z) \widehat{n}(pq^z).\end{aligned}$$

We now make for $\widehat{n}$ and $\widehat{g}$ the following ansatz:

$$\widehat{g}(p) = 2C \theta(p) \exp(-|Dp|^{2/z}), \quad (9)$$

$$\widehat{n}(p) = A \exp(-|Bp|^{\beta/z}), \quad (10)$$

where A, B, C, D are parameters depending on d, z and λ . It was actually found that the direct numerical solution of the MC equations in one dimension were well-fitted by this ansatz [8]. The same choice for $\widehat{g}(p)$ (but not for $\widehat{n}(p)$) was also made in [13]. The invariance of Eqs. (7) and (8) under the rescaling: $\widehat{n}(p) \rightarrow \widehat{n}(p/\alpha)/\alpha^2$, $\widehat{g}(p) \rightarrow \widehat{g}(p/\alpha)$ [21] allows us to choose $D = 1$. This ansatz gives in x space, for large x :

$$\begin{aligned}g(x) &\simeq \text{const } x^{-1-2/z} + i 2C x^{-1}, \\ n(x) &\simeq \text{const } x^{-1-\beta/z},\end{aligned}$$

which have the right asymptotic properties. (This seems to be the key ingredient in achieving the integer value of 4 for d_c rather than a number like 3.6...). We are forced to set $C = 1/2$ to get the right large x behavior of g_I . Then $\widehat{g}_R$ is simply $\frac{1}{2}e^{-|p|^{2/z}}$. We choose to match Eqs. (7) and (8) in the limit $p \rightarrow 0$, which means matching the most divergent terms on both sides of these two equations, and is equivalent to matching the large x behavior. Since $|g(x)|^{-2} \simeq x^2$ for large x , in the small p limit, the left hand side in both equations (7,8) is dominated by the terms $d^2 \widehat{n}/dp^2$, $d^2 \widehat{g}_R/dp^2$, giving [22]:

$$(2-z)/z^2 = \lim_{p \rightarrow 0} |p|^{2-2/z} \widehat{I}_1(p), \quad (11)$$

$$AB^{\beta/z} \beta(\beta-z)/z^2 = \lim_{p \rightarrow 0} |p|^{2-\beta/z} \widehat{I}_2(p). \quad (12)$$

Performing the integrals and taking the limit one gets the following equations:

$$\frac{PAS_d}{B} = \frac{d(2-z)}{\pi z^2} \frac{1}{BI(B, z)}, \quad (13)$$

$$\frac{PAS_d}{B^2} = \frac{\beta(\beta-z)}{\pi z^2} \frac{2^{(2z-\beta)/\beta}}{\Gamma(\frac{2z-\beta}{\beta})/\beta}, \quad (14)$$

where $S_d = \int_0^\pi d\theta \sin^{d-2} \theta = 2^{d-2} \Gamma((d-1)/2)/\Gamma(d-1)$ and $I(B, z) = \int_0^\infty ds (1-2s^2)s^{2z-3} \exp(-B^{\beta/z} s^\beta - s^2)$. Setting $d = 1$, $z = 3/2$ in the expression for $B = B(z, d)$ obtained from Eqs. (13) and (14) we find that B approaches 1, and then (since $\beta \rightarrow 2$) $\widehat{n}(p) \propto \widehat{g}_R(p)$, as required by the fluctuation-dissipation theorem. In the limit $d \rightarrow 0$ we get the correct value $z = 4/3$. As z approaches 2, $BI(B, z) \rightarrow \frac{1}{4\sqrt{\pi}}$ and the right

hand side of Eq. (13) goes to zero. It is reasonable to assume that A is a finite number [23], which forces $B \simeq (2-z)^{-1}$. From comparison with equation (14) one gets $2z - \beta = 4 - d - 4(2-z) \simeq (2-z)^2$ which gives $4-d = 4(2-z) + O((2-z)^2)$. Note that this result, not only fixes d_c to be 4, but also provide an expansion for z around d_c^- : $z = 2 - (4-d)/4$. In the simplest scenario $B = (\text{const}(2-z))^{-1}$, where the constant is fixed to 2 by the value of B in $d = 1$. Eqs. (13) and (14) are then easily solved numerically for $1 < d < 4$, giving $z \simeq 1.62$ in $d = 2$ and $z \simeq 1.78$ in $d = 3$. The result in $d = 2$ is in good agreement with the values found in the literature from simulations (which of course do not use the MC approximation) and also with the direct numerical solution of the MC equations by Tu, which we suspect may be accurate for $d \lesssim 2$.

The results $d_c = 4$ and $z = 2 - (4-d)/4 + O((4-d)^2)$ are very robust: assuming a simple scaling form for $\widehat{n}(p)$ as z approaches 2, they can be derived without any specific assumption on the form of the scaling functions, other than the following weak requirements for the small p behaviour of the scaling functions: $\widehat{g}_R(p) \simeq C(1 - kp^{2/z})$, $\widehat{n}(p) \simeq A(1 - k'(pB)^{\beta/z})$, where k and k' are constants of order 1 as $z \rightarrow 2$. The scaling form for $\widehat{n}(p)$ is:

$$\widehat{n}(p) = A \widehat{f}(Bp), \quad (15)$$

where $B = (2(2-z))^{-1}$, $\widehat{f}(0) = 1$, and $Af(0)$ is finite as $z \rightarrow 2$ [24] ($f(x)$ denotes the inverse Fourier transform of $\widehat{f}(p)$). We fix the scale on which $\widehat{g}$ varies to be of order 1 [25]. When z is close to 2, $\widehat{g}_R(p)$ is a slowly varying function compared with $\widehat{n}(p)$, which allows us to perform the integral $\widehat{I}_1(p)$ to the leading order in $(2-z)$. Matching Eq. (7) at $p = 0$ gives:

$$\frac{PAS_d}{B} = \frac{d(2-z)}{\pi z^2} \frac{2kz}{f(0)}. \quad (16)$$

Thus $B \simeq (2-z)^{-1}$, consistent with our assumption. A similar analysis of Eq. (8) in the limit $p \rightarrow 0$ gives

$$\frac{PAS_d}{B^2} = \frac{\beta(\beta-z)}{\pi z^2} (2z - \beta)k, \quad (17)$$

which again leads to $B^2 \simeq (4z - d - 4)^{-1}$, and thus to $d_c = 4$, $z = 2 - (4-d)/4 + O((4-d)^2)$. Eqs. (16) and (17) are of course consistent with Eqs. (13) and (14) obtained from our original ansatz.

Let us now briefly discuss what could have gone wrong in Tu's numerical analysis. Assume our ansatz (9) for $\widehat{g}(p)$ is reliable for all p as d approaches 4. Then in $d = 4$

$g(x) = (g(0)^{-1} - ix)^{-1}$. Thus the imaginary part of g has a peak at $x = g(0)^{-1}$. We broke the scale invariance by choosing $D = 1$, which gives $g(0) = 1$ and lead to $n(0) \simeq (2 - z)$. Tu chose instead to break the invariance by fixing the value of $n(0)$ to be some constant. Rescaling our solution to make it compatible with Tu's choice, we would get $g(0) \simeq (2 - z)$, which causes the peak in the imaginary part to run to infinity, making it very difficult to get an accurate evaluation of the integral $I_1(x)$. It would be very interesting to repeat Tu's analysis in the light of our findings on the scaling form of $n(x)$ near the upper critical dimension.

The validity of our results beyond the mode-coupling approximation is an important consideration. We expect that the result $d_c = 4$ will hold beyond mode-coupling, as argued in Ref. [14]. However, we know of no argument that would imply that $z \simeq 2 - (4 - d)/4$ would remain true outside the MC approximation i.e. there might be corrections at $O(4 - d)$ to the value of the dynamical exponent z from the diagrams not included in the MC approximation.

To summarise, we have developed a self-consistent approach to the strong coupling regime of the KPZ equation. We constructed an ansatz for the scaling functions which is consistent with known asymptotic results, and gives naturally an integer upper critical dimension $d_c = 4$. It also provides for the first time a satisfactory expansion of z around d_c . Solving for $z = z(d)$ gives good agreement with previous studies for all $1 \leq d \leq 2$. We showed also how the same results can be obtained with much weaker requirements on the form of the scaling functions, if one assumes a scaling form for $\hat{n}$. We found a possible mechanism for the failure of Tu's numerical analysis as d approached d_c . Our results together with previous numerical MC studies for $d = 1$ and $d = 2$, [8,21], and with the analysis above $d = 4$ of Ref. [14], give a semi-quantitative picture of the behavior of the strong-coupling regime of the KPZ equation for all dimensions d .

The authors acknowledge the support of EPSRC under grants GR/L38578 and GR/L97698. F.C. would like to thank Alan Bray, Andrea Cavagna, Alessandro Flammini, and Uwe Täuber for discussions.

-
- [1] M. Kardar, G. Parisi, and Y-C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **56**, 889 (1986).
[2] D. Forster, D.R. Nelson, and M.J. Stephen Phys. Rev. A **16**, 732 (1977).
[3] D.A. Huse, C.L. Henley, and D.S. Fisher, Phys. Rev. Lett. **55**, 2924 (1985); M. Kardar and Y-C. Zhang Phys. Rev. Lett. **58**, 2087 (1987).
[4] J.Z. Imbrie and T. Spencer, J. Stat. Phys. **52**, 609 (1988); J. Cook and B. Derrida, Europhys. Lett. **10**, 195 (1989); J. Cook and B. Derrida, J. Phys. A **23**, 1523 (1990); M.R. Evans and B. Derrida, J. Stat. Phys. **69**, 427 (1992).
[5] G. Parisi J. Phys (Paris) **51**,1595 (1990); M.Mezard J. Phys (Paris) **51**,1831 (1990)
[6] For a review see J. Krug and H. Spohn in *Solids far from equilibrium: Growth morphology and defects*, ed. by C. Godreche (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1992); A.-L. Barabasi and H. E. Stanley *Fractal Concepts in Surface Growth* (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1995); T. Halpin-Healy and Y-C. Zhang Phys. Rep. **254**, 215 (1995).
[7] M. Kardar Nucl. Phys. B **290**, 582 (1987).
[8] T. Hwa and E. Frey, Phys. Rev. A **44**, R7873 (1991); E. Frey, T. Hwa, and U.C. Täuber, Phys. Rev. E **53**, 4424 (1996).
[9] L. H. Tang Phys Rev. A **45**, 7162 (1992); T. Ala-Nissila, T. Hjelt, J.M. Kosterlitz, and O. Venäläinen, J. Stat. Phys. **72**, 207 (1993), E. Marinari, A. Pagnani and G. Parisi cond-mat/0005105.
[10] M. Marsili, A. Maritan, F. Toigo, and J.R. Banavar Rev. Mod. Phys. **68**, 963 (1996).
[11] M.Schwartz and S.F. Edwards, Europhys. Lett. **20**, 310 (1992).
[12] J.P. Bouchaud and M.E. Cates, Phys. Rev. E **47**, R1455 (1993).
[13] J.P. Doherty, M.A. Moore, J.M. Kim, and A. Bray, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 2041 (1994).
[14] M.A. Moore, T. Blum, J.P. Doherty, M. Marsili J.P. Bouchaud, and P. Claudin, Phys. Rev. Lett **74**, 4257 (1995).
[15] T. Blum and A. J. McKane, Phys Rev. E **52**, 4741 (1995).
[16] J.K. Bhattacharjee, J. Phys. A **31**, L93 (1998).
[17] M. Lässig Nucl. Phys. **B448**,559 (1995); M. Lässig and H. Kinzelbach, Phys. Rev. Lett **78**, 906 (1997).
[18] K. J. Wiese, J. Stat. Phys. **93**, 143 (1998).
[19] T. Halpin-Healy, Phys Rev. Lett. **62**, 445 (1989); T. Halpin-Healy, Phys Rev. A **42**, 711 (1990).
[20] C. Castellano, M. Marsili and L. Pietronero, Phys Rev. Lett. **80**, 3527 (1998); C. Castellano, A. Gabrielli, M. Marsili, M.A. Muñoz, and L. Pietronero, Phys Rev. E **58**, R5209 (1998); C. Castellano, M. Marsili, M.A. Muñoz, and L. Pietronero, Phys Rev. E **59**, 6460 (1999).
[21] Y. Tu, Phys. Rev. Lett **73**, 3109 (1994).
[22] Note that matching the most divergent terms in the derivatives of Eqs. (7) and (8) as $p \rightarrow 0$ gives no new information, and matching next terms would involve contributions other than the one coming from $d^2\hat{n}/d^2p$ and $d^2\hat{g}_R/d^2p$ in the left hand side of equation (7,8).
[23] Matching Eq. (5) at $x = 0$ with our ansatz for $\hat{n}(p)$ gives $AP = 2/J$ where J is a convergent integral in the limit $z \rightarrow 2$, $d \rightarrow 4$.
[24] Again, matching Eq. (5) at $x = 0$ gives $PAf(0) = 4\pi/J'$, where J' is a convergent integral in the limit $z \rightarrow 2$, $d \rightarrow 4$, dependent on the specific form of the scaling function $\hat{f}$.
[25] Due to the rescaling invariance of Eqs. (4) and (5), the only relevant quantity is the relative scale of variation of $\hat{n}$ and $\hat{g}$.